

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION

DARIUS WILLIAMS

PLAINTIFF

v.

CAUSE NO. 3:23-CV-2982-CWR-LGI

MADISON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI,
ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendants' motion to dismiss for lack of prosecution. Docket No. 60. They claim dismissal is appropriate because Plaintiff failed to inform the Court of his intent to retain counsel or proceed pro se following his former counsel's withdrawal from the case. Defendants also claim that Plaintiff failed to comply with discovery requests while he was represented by counsel.

Since the filing of Defendants' motion, Plaintiff has informed the Magistrate Judge that he desires to proceed pro se. Albeit tardy, Plaintiff has complied with the Order of the Court.¹ Further, Defendants have not shown a failure to comply with discovery obligations that would warrant dismissal. Their motion to dismiss for lack of prosecution is, therefore, denied.

The parties are instructed to contact the Magistrate Judge within 14 days to discuss next steps.

SO ORDERED, this the 8th day of January, 2025.

s/ Carlton W. Reeves

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff is currently detained at the Bradshaw State Jail in Henderson, Texas. Given the complexities of pursuing litigation while in custody, Plaintiff's delay in responding to the Court—which totaled less than one month—does not rise to the level warranting dismissal.